

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13300-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,667

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected all pending-claims 1-14. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1-5 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter (US-2004/0004488; hereinafter "Baxter") in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"). The Office Action also rejected claims 6-8 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of AAPA, and further in view of Morishige et al. (US-2006/0214890; hereinafter "Morishige").

Discussion for 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of AAPA (Figure 1-4; or section of related art in the instant specification).

In page 2 of the Office Action, Examiner admitted Baxter does not disclose the features of "providing a P-type transistor, wherein a gate of the P-type transistor is connected to another terminal of the third switch, but AAPA has disclosed those features which describe page 2-3 of the instant specification. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art can accordingly combine Baxter with AAPA to achieve all of the features as set forth in claims 1 and 2. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits the steps of "providing a P-type transistor, wherein a gate of the P-type transistor is connected to another terminal of the third switch" as set forth in claim 1, that the gate of the P-type transistor is connected to another terminal of the third switch, so in accordance with the disclosed figure 5 of the

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13300-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,667

present application, when the third switch 524c is not turned on yet, the gate of the P-type transistor is floating, and another terminal of the third switch 524c is disconnected to another terminal of the first capacitor 522a and the second capacitor 522b. So if the switch 66 is the third switch 524c construed by Examiner, conceivably, when the switch 66 is not turned on yet, another terminal of the switch 66 should be disconnected to the another terminal of the capacitor Cx and the capacitor Cr. However, in accordance with the disclosed figure 13 in Baxter, when the switch 66 is not turned on yet, another terminal of the switch 66 is connected to another terminal of the capacitor Cx and the capacitor Cr and is connected to the ground. It is obviously the switch 66 is not the third switch 524c.

Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art can not base on Baxter to combine with AAPA to achieve all of the features as set forth in claim 1. So claim 1 is patentable over Baxter, AAPA, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

For similarly reasons for claim 1, because of the switch 66 is not the third switch 524c, so as set forth in claim 2 can not either based on Baxter to combine with AAPA to achieve all of those features therein. So claim 2 is patentable over Baxter, AAPA, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

For similarly reasons for claim 1, because of as set forth in claim 3 is for measuring at least two capacitor pairs, but the measuring implement of each of the capacitor pairs is similar to as set forth in claim 1, so Baxter combined with AAPA can not to achieve all of the features as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, Baxter combined with AAPA can not

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13300-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,667

either to achieve all of the features as set forth in claim 3, and thus should be allowed, then its dependent claims 4 and 5 are allowable as a matter of law.

For similar reasons for claim 1, because of the switch 66 is not the third switch 524c, so as set forth in claim 9 can not either based on Baxter to combine with AAPA to achieve all of those features therein. So claim 9 is patentable over Baxter, AAPA, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed, then its dependent claims 10 and 11 are allowable as a matter of law.

Claims 6-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of AAPA, and further in view of Morishige.

In response thereto, Applicant respectfully submits that for the allowable independent claims 3 and 9, so its corresponding dependent claims 6-8 and 12-14 thus should be allowable as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13300-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,667

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims 1-14 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date:

Feb. 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw
Usa@jicpgroup.com.tw